

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-3, 6-21, 24-31, and 33-46 are pending in this office action. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-15, 17-22, 25-35, 37-43, 45, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsunaga (US Patent No. 6,577,934) in view of Adams (U.S. Patent No. 6,718,470).

Applicants have amended each independent claim to more clearly specify Applicants' claimed invention so that the step of authenticating and/or authentication is unmistakable. As such, Applicants look forward to the withdrawal of the rejections and an early notice of allowance.

MPEP § 2141.03 requires:

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).

The Examiner asserts that Matsunaga teaches that authentication take place with an internal gateway and an external network (col. 12, line 1 through col. 13, line 5). Office Action, page 3. The Examiner is mistaken. Taught in the cited passages of Matsunaga is a method of registration, not of authentication, as that term is known to one of ordinary skill in the art. Matsunaga teaches a method for checking whether a node is registered and if it is not, then the node is refused connection. In contrast, as is known to one of ordinary skill in the art, authentication requires verifying the identity of a source.

Further, the Examiner is mistaken that Adams teaches authenticating first and second devices, both residing in the vehicle. Office Action, page 3. The Examiner does not cite any support for this statement and the Applicants are at a loss to understand how Adams teaches authenticating first and second devices, both residing in the

vehicle, because there is no mention of vehicles in Adams at all. Thus, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

However, to make clear Applicants' claimed invention, each independent claim of Applicants' application has been amended to add limitations to how authentication is performed in Applicants' claimed invention. For example, Claim 1 requires that the step of authenticating be performed by *a) requesting, from [an] entity, a certificate comprising a vehicle manufacturer signature, b) receiving a message comprising the requested certificate, and c) determining whether the entity is an authenticated entity based on the received message* and Claim 8 requires that the step of authenticating be performed by *(a) generating a first random number, (b) conveying, to the entity, the first random number and a request that the entity send a certificate comprising a vehicle manufacturer signature, and (c) receiving a message comprising the certificate having a vehicle manufacturer signature and further comprising an entity signature, an entity manufacturer signature, the first random number, and a second random number*. Such claim limitations are not taught or described by Matsunaga and/or Adams as required by MPEP § 2141. Thus, because such limitations are not taught or described by the cited art and are required by MPEP § 2141, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be withdrawn.

The Applicants believe that the subject application is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
1303 East Algonquin Road
IL01/3rd Floor
Schaumburg, IL 60196
Customer Number: 22917

By: /Terri S. Hughes/
Terri S. Hughes
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 41,856

Telephone: 847-576-0741
Fax No.: 847-576-0721